

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is requested.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy of a telephone interview extended by Examiner Julio Maldonado on December 19, 2003. During the telephone interview, 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections set forth in the November 20, 2003 Office Action were discussed. Applicant proposed amendments to claims as set forth in the "claims" section of this response. Examiner Maldonado agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections.

In this response, claims 35-37, 50, 56, 62, and 66-67 have been amended. New claims 68-69 have been added. Claims 35-37, 40-63, and 65-69 are in the application for consideration.

Claims 35-37, 40-63, and 65-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In view of the amendment, such claims are now believed to have overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections. Since no other issues remain outstanding, claims 35-37, 40-63, and 65-67 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Amended claim 66 is believed to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection. Withdrawal of rejection of claim 66 is requested.

Application Serial No. 09/887,049  
Response to Office Action dated 11/20/03

New claim 68 is allowable at least for similar reasons set forth with respect to claim 35 in Applicant's response dated August 4, 2003, in addition to its own recited claim features. For example, claim 68 recites, in part, an inner conductive core operably connected with and suspended between the spaced-apart terminal members above the outer surface; a polymer dielectric layer surrounding the suspended inner conductive core; and an outer conductive sheath surrounding a substantial portion of the polymer dielectric layer while leaving some void space between the outer conductive sheath and the outer surface. None of the references of record teach or suggest such claim elements. Claim 68 is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. As claim 69 depends from claim 68, it too is allowable.

It is believed that this application is in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is requested.

The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned in the event that the next Office Action is one other than a Notice of Allowance. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 22, 2003 By: K. Satheesh KV  
Satheesh Karra  
Reg. No. 40,246